

Remarks

Claims 1-6 and 13-21 are at issue. Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al (US 6,026,151) in view of Ng et al (US 6,243,376). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Ng and further in view of Lin et al (US 6,791,952). Claims 5 & 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Ng and further in view of Gerszberg et al (US 6,542,500). Claims 7, 8 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Bauer. Claims 9-11 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Bauer and further in view of Gerszberg. Claims 12 & 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Bauer and further in view of Ng. Claim 21 is allowable.

Title

The applicants respectfully disagree that the title is not descriptive, but will accept any title the Examiner suggests.

Claims

Claim 1 requires a home gateway system. On page 7, lines 15-16 it states that the "home gateway system" is located inside the house. Throughout the specification, it is clear that a home gateway system is associated with each house, not part of the PSTN. The Examiner points to FIG. 1, Col. 3, lines 5-8 as showing a home gateway system. This section discusses switches 21-24 which are "Local Exchange Carriers

(LEC) end offices or access tandem switches.” See Col. 3, lines 2-4 of Bauer. One skilled in the art would not be confused that a LEC switching network is a “home gateway system”. Claim 1 is clearly allowable over the prior art.

In addition, Bauer does not teach sending a message to an ISP including a destination number dialed at step (b). The Examiner points to FIG. 7, Col. 11, lines 62-65. However there is no discussion there or anywhere in Bauer about a destination number. Bauer is not concerned with telephone calls over the Internet, but with finding the cheapest method of accessing the ISP for standard Internet services such as the World Wide Web and email (See Abstract). Clearly Bauer does not teach anything about Internet telephone calls or about home gateway systems. Claim 1 is clearly allowable.

Claims 2 - 6 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 7 – 12 have been cancelled.

Claim 13 is directed to a home gateway system. In the home gateway system is a switch and a router. The only elements in Lin that could be considered a home gateway system are element 101 and 406. Element 101 is just described as a transceiver and element 406 is described as a subscriber transceiver. This is only one of the elements of claim 13. Adding Bauer to Lin adds nothing, since Bauer does not describe a home gateway system at all. Claim 13 is allowable.

Claims 14-16 and 20 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 17 requires that the ISP and television processing system send information over a selected channel of a television. This is not shown in any of the prior art references. Claim 17 is allowable.


Claim 18 requires that a TV processing system receive an email request. There is no discussion of email in Gerszberg and the other references do not show a TV processing system receiving an email request. Claim 18 is allowable.

Claim 19 requires an emergency broadcast network receiver. This is not shown in any of the prior art references. Claim 19 is allowable.

Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

(Bossemeyer et al.)

By 
Attorney for the Applicant
Dale B. Halling
Reg. No.: 38,170
Customer No.: 25,007
Phone: (719) 447-1990
Fax: (719) 447-9815

I hereby certify that an Response is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

7/20/05
Date


Signature (Dale B. Halling)